REMARKS

I. Introduction

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 18-21 have been added. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Prior Art Rejections

The Office Action mailed September 11, 2007 rejected claims 1-9 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Breed (U.S. Patent 6,944,628) and Tanner (U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0243588) and newly cited Penzias et al. (U.S. Patent 5,577,120); and rejected claims 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by De Breed and newly cited Penzias et al. All rejections are traversed below and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As amended and discussed during the Examiner Interview conducted on February 11, 2008, claims 1 and 17 each recite:

> target dataset containing anonymous data derived from at least one of pubic, private, proprietary and customer-related datasets, excluding the source dataset, the target dataset containing records for non-uniquely identified persons, each record including a target name, a target age, and a target age-date indicating an exact or approximate date of the target age

(*e.g.* claim 1, lines 7-11). In contrast, Penzias et al. teaches retrieving personal information from a governmental data source (*e.g.* the Federal Bureau of Investigation according to column 4, lines 25-67). Moreover, the Office Action concedes on page 6, line 1, that De Breed "does not explicitly teach: a private data source" and, for the reasons discussed in the Amendments filed on November 21, 2006 and May 22, 2007, Tanner fails to teach a "private source dataset" as recited in claims 1 and 17. Therefore, claims 1 and 17 as well as claims 2-9, which depend on claim 1, are patentably distinguishable over De Breed, Tanner and Penzias et al., alone or in combination.

Claim 10 recites "automatically determining, without uniquely identifying information on the target person" at lines 6-7. In contrast, Penzias et al. teaches physical verification information, which is uniquely identifying information, in column 2 at lines 35-54. Moreover, the Office Action concedes on page 3, line 14, that De Breed does not teach "without a key or

identifier uniquely identifying the target person" and it is similarly acknowledged that <u>De Breed</u> fails to teach "automatically determining, without uniquely identifying information on the target person" as recited in claim 10. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 10 as well as claims 11-13, which depend therefrom, are patentably distinguishable over <u>De Breed</u> and <u>Penzias et al.</u>, alone or in combination.

III. New Claims

New claim 18 recites "wherein the private source dataset consists of customer data" at lines 1-2. Nothing has been cited in <u>De Breed</u>, <u>Tanner</u> and <u>Penzias et al.</u>, alone or in combination that teaches or suggests what is recited in claim 18. Therefore, is submitted that claim 18 is patentably distinguishable over <u>De Breed</u>, <u>Tanner</u> and <u>Penzias et al.</u>, alone or in combination.

New claim 19 recites "wherein the private source dataset is not stored on a portable device" at lines 1-2. Nothing has been cited in <u>De Breed</u>, <u>Tanner</u> and <u>Penzias et al.</u>, alone or in combination that teaches or suggests what is recited in claim 18. Therefore, is submitted that claim 19 is patentably distinguishable over <u>De Breed</u>, <u>Tanner</u> and <u>Penzias et al.</u>, alone or in combination.

New claim 20 recites:

> wherein determining whether the particular source person
> corresponds to a particular target person in the target dataset
> includes checking whether at least one of the source name, the
> source unique identifier, the source date of birth, and the source
> address of the uniquely identified person stored in the private
> source corresponds to the particular target person in the target
> dataset

at lines 1-5. Nothing has been cited in <u>De Breed</u>, <u>Tanner</u> and <u>Penzias et al.</u>, alone or in combination that teaches or suggests what is recited in claim 20. Therefore, is submitted that claim 20 is patentably distinguishable over <u>De Breed</u>, <u>Tanner</u> and <u>Penzias et al.</u>, alone or in combination.

New claim 21 recites:

> wherein determining whether the particular source person
> corresponds to a particular target person in the target dataset
> includes an projected degree of accuracy and the projected
> degree of accuracy is improved by checking whether more than
> one of the source name, the source unique identifier, the source
> date of birth, and the source address of the uniquely identified
> person stored in the private source corresponds to the particular
> target person in the target dataset

at lines 1-6. Nothing has been cited in <u>De Breed</u>, <u>Tanner</u> and <u>Penzias et al.</u>, alone or in combination that teaches or suggests what is recited in claim 21. Therefore, is submitted that claim 20 is patentably distinguishable over <u>De Breed</u>, <u>Tanner</u> and <u>Penzias et al.</u>, alone or in combination.

IV. Request for Interview

It is believed that the amendments herein overcome the prior art of record. If the present amendments do not overcome <u>De Breed</u>, <u>Tanner</u> and <u>Penzias et al.</u>, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned to arrange an Examiner Interview to discuss what further amendments may be necessary to clearly distinguish over the prior art.

V. Conclusion

In addition, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Finally, if there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____

By: _____
    David E. Moore
    Registration No. 59,047

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501